DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 388 CG 016 516

AUTHOR McDonald, Gerald W.
TITLE Marital Jealousy: A Structural Exchange Perspective.
PUB DATE 13 Oct 82
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations (Washington, DC, October 13-16, 1982).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - General (140) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Style; Emotional Response; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Jealousy; *Marriage; Models; Personality Traits; Sex Differences; Sex Role; Sexuality; Social Behavior; *Social Exchange Theory; *Spouses; State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS *Structural Exchange Theory

ABSTRACT

Although the experience of jealously is among the most common of experiences in intimate relationships, little theoretical or empirical work has been done from a sociologial perspective to increase our understanding of this aspect of male-female relationships. An investigation of marital jealousy as a sociological rather than a psychological phenomenon, using a social exchange framework; more specifically a "structural exchange framework" will focus on the influence of the societal normative structure in the interpersonal relationship. This framework suggests that it is the normative definitions of marriage and marital roles, particularly regarding the parameters and legitimacy of jealousy, and the reciprocal cognitive orientations of the spouses related to sex role socialization, that dictate how spouses deal with and resolve jealousy. A structural exchange perspective takes these differing dimensions into account and thus, is one major avenue by which to understand marital jealousy more fully. Further empirical research is needed to test the viability of the structural exchange model. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227388

MARITAL JEALOUSY: A STRUCTURAL EXCHANGE PERSPECTIVE*

by

Gerald W. McDonald
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gerald W. McDonald

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 016516

* A paper prepared for presentation at NCFR Pre-Conference Workshop on Theory and Methods in Washington, D.C., October 13, 1982.

Marital Jealousy: A Structural Exchange Perspective

The experience of jealousy is among the most common experiences in intimate relationships. However, little theoretical or empirical work has been done from a sociological perspective to increase our understanding of this aspect of male-female relationships, whether marital or nonmarital. Most of the existing literature on jealousy is oriented toward its character as a personality trait, or clinically-oriented in suggesting ways in which feelings of jealousy can be managed or alleviated. As has been observed earlier (McDonald and Osmond, 1980), a major explanation for the neglect of "jealousy" as a focus of scholarly study in family sociology is that it has most commonly been viewed as a psychological phenomenon or "emotion" and, as such, has not been seen as central to an understanding of the sociological and social psychological dynamics of male-female interaction.

This paper continues the research agenda begun by McDonald and Osmond (1980) of investigating interpersonal jealousy as a sociological, rather than psychological, phenomenon and building a solid theoretical base by which to generate theoretical propositions and testable hypotheses within the sociological domain. This theory-building effort is launched from a dynamic, interactional perspective though not neglecting the social structural aspects of interpersonal behavior. In this regard, a social exchange framework is utilized in order to center our attention on the interactional, or behavioral interdependence, aspect of jealousy. However, an elaborated model of social exchange theory, termed "structural exchange," is more specifically employed in order to explicitly and systematically incorporate the influence of the societal normative structure on the interpersonal relationship rather than focusing exclusively on the interaction

dynamics of the individuals involved. The need for a more comprehensive approach to the study of interpersonal jealousy has recently been noted by "jealousy" researchers (Bringle, 1977; Jaremko and Lindsey, 1979; Shettel-Neuber, et al., 1978; White, 1981), most of whom have taken a "personality-trait" perspective to the study of jealousy. Shettel-Neuber, et al., conclude from their research that "...the present results suggest that situational or cultural (e.g., sex role) factors are more important than personality characteristics in determining the nature and magnitude of jealousy" (p. 614-615). Similarly, White (1981) has observed: "In any one instance of jealousy, the particular constellation of cognitive, emotional and behavioral responses are assumed to be related to intrapersonal, dyadic, situational and cultural influences" (p.24). A structural exchange approach to jealousy addresses each of these levels of concern, as well as their interrelationships in influencing jealousy as a relationship variable. Further, it should be noted that this paper will focus particularly on marital jealousy and will be distinguished from jealousy in nonmarital relationships although, as will be observed, there are considerable similarities. However, the unique social arrangement of marriage has specific implications for a structural exchange perspective on jealousy. Thus, the major purpose of this paper is two-fold: (1) To develop a more exhaustive theoretical foundation for jealousy research and; (2) To demonstrate the applicability of a structural exchange theory for addressing substantive research questions in family sociology; in this instance, marital jealousy.

A Structural Exchange Approach to Marital Jealousy

It has recently been argued (McDonald, 1981) that social exchange theory needs to be broadened considerably to be able to more adequately explain the dynamics of social behavior in such a unique social arrangement as marriage. This uniqueness rests on the nature of marriage, which generally has a lengthy temporal duration and evidences structural and normative constraints, often resulting in differential role expectations and obligations of the marital partners, an unequal distribution of resources and, thus, an asymmetrical exchange context. Further, this exchange context is more often cooperative, rather than competitive, in nature and as such is strongly influenced by the development of commitment and trust that the partners may develop toward each other over the length of the marriage. A structural exchange approach to marriage broadens considerably our ability to understand and explain the dynamics of social behavior in such a unique social arrangement, in contrast to more traditional, and often more myopic, social exchange theories. Kemper (1978), for instance, has argued against an exchange theory model of emotions, including jealousy, because exchange theory has tended to focus on power, as an interactional dynamic, to the exclusion of "status" considerations as a structural dynamic. The model presented here directly addresses this deficiency by systematically examining the structural antecedents to marital exchange dynamics.

A structural exchange approach to marital jealousy takes these unique characteristics of the marital relationship into account by focusing on: (1) The normative orientations of the partners toward marriage and marital roles. These include the guiding cultural and subcultural normative expectations regarding the nature of the relationship, such as the nature of the

interactional exchange process, the legitimate/illegitimate domains of jealousy, and especially as it defines the power/dependence relationship, equity assumptions, definitions of "spouse as property" and exclusivity expectations; (2) The cognitive orientations of the marital partners. This refers to the beliefs, values and general relationship orientation of the persons in the marriage and includes the personality and attitudinal aspects of each individual affecting the relationship. More specifically, of concern here are the individually-tailored perspectives on feelings of jealousy and jealousy behaviors that the persons hold in the relationship and which govern the nature of exchange transactions regarding jealousy; and (3) The marital exchange relationship which results. The general exchange dynamics of the two persons in the relationship and the resulting patterning of jealousy-related interactions are, thus, brought to attention, most notably as they are affected by power/dependence, equity, and the development of levels of commitment and trust in the relationship.

The application of such a dynamic model of marital behavior will allow for the study of the development of competition in the relationship upon the perceived intrusion of a "trespasser" and the resultant influence on the nature of rewards, costs and outcomes in the exchange relationship; particularly, as it affects the comparison level and comparison level alternatives for both partners. In this way, a better understanding of the dynamics of the jealousy-related interaction, and the outcomes and resolutions of such jealousy situations can, hopefully, be achieved.

It is important to note at the outset that marital jealousy is not a unidimensional phenomenon. Jealousy is differentiated, in particular, by: (1) the nature of the threatening object; (2) the nature of the threat

itself, or the form in which the resources are perceived as in jeopardy; and, (3) the nature of the emotions aroused by the perceived threat. Further, sexual jealousy is most often thought of when jealousy is discussed. This, of course, involves the perceived competition with another person, usually of one's own sex, for one's spouse. However, such competition may also occur with another person in a non-sexual context, such as the spouse's friends, family or colleagues. Often, a husband experiences jealousy of a new child as the wife shifts her attention from the husband to the baby. A spouse may also be threatened by such intangible threats as the competition felt from the marital partner's extra-familial involvement such as work/career commitments, recreational commitments, etc. In addition, jealousy may be aroused because of the feeling that not enough time is being spent together. These have been referred to (Clanton and Smith, 1977) as person jealousy, opportunity/situation jealousy and time jealousy, respectively. Though sexual jealousy is often alluded to in this paper, a more general approach to marital jealousy is taken herein and the model presented is argued to be applicable to a wide range of jealousy experiences.

Marital Jealousy: A Structural Exchange Conceptualization

As observed earlier, jealousy has most generally been defined within the parameters of a psychological emotion. Depending on the approach taken, the bases or origins of the jealousy emotion were initially described as residing in the inherent, instinctual nature of the individual (Darwin, 1888; Westermarck, 1922) and, more recently, as being a product of socialization through the internalization of societal and cultural norms. This latter explanation provides the beginnings of a more sociological

approach to the study of jealousy in recognizing the role of cultural expectations and normative definitions in the experience of jealousy. The most prominant sociological approaches have been either from a functional perspective (Davis, 1936), viewing jealousy as a product of monogamy, functioning to maintain monogamy as a "cultural cornerstone," or a labeling perspective (Schachter, 1964; Walster and Walster, 1977) emphasizing that societal beliefs about what emotions are appropriate in various settings serve to provide a labeling of jealousy as a feeling-state whenever physiological arousal occurs. However, a strong sociologically-based exchange theory definition of jealousy requires a shifting of the locus of jealousy from being an emotion inherent within the individual to being an interactional property of relationships.

Kingsley Davis (1936), in his essay entitled "Jealousy and Sexual Property," provided the first sociological definition of jealousy. Davis presented a functionalist explanation of sexual jealousy and defined jealousy, more generally, as a "...fear or rage reaction to a threatened appropriation of one's own, or what is desired to be one's own, property" (p. 395). This definition is largely congruent with a structural exchange perspective. Exchange theories generally have certain utilitarian, or property-based, assumptions. This is particularly the case for a structural exchange model of marital interaction in that emotional and sexual exclusivity, conceptualized by Davis as "private property", has traditionally been one of the major normative expectations of marriage in our society. Thus, the argument can effectively be made that an affectionate relationship between two persons can be conceived of as a property-oriented relationship.

Davis further specifies four elements as necessary for studying conflicts over property, and thus jealousy: (1) owner; (2) object; (3) public; and, (4) rival or trespasser. The "owner" would be considered that individual who considers the other as property, and in jealousy situations, who feels that his or her property is threatened. The "object" would be the threatened property and the "rival or trespasser" would be the threat itself. Further, the inclusion of the "public" as one of the four elements can be taken to argue for the normative component of jealousy, or the "normative orientations" in structural exchange, and is an element which has been largely neglected, if not excluded, in the application of more traditional social exchange models of jealousy. In this regard, Davis states: "A popular fallacy has been to conceive the jealous situation as a triangle. Actually it is a quadrangle and the failure to include the public or community element has led to a failure to grasp the social character of jealousy. The relationships between the four elements are institutionally defined. They constitute the fixed traditional constellation of rights, obligations and neutralities called property and are sustained by interacting attitudes" (p.395). This is consistent with a structural exchange model. It recognizes that societal normative orientations toward jealousy define the institutionalized expectations of marriage and marital roles and that the resulting attitudes of the partners regarding jealousy (the cognitive orientation) in interpersonal interaction (the marital exchange relationship) continue to foster, and perhaps also modify, those normative definitions within the relationship, while also contributing to ongoing normative definitions more generally.

It is important to recognize that Davis conceptualized the threat as

being either "rival" or "trespasser." For the purpose at hand, this would relate to the nature, or the developmental stage, of the intimate relationship and the strength of the notion of partner as property. Thus, in one sense, jealousy can be viewed as arising from a legitimate competition for desired property, with a felt danger of superior rivalry. This would be characteristic of jealousy in dating relationships primarily, and perhaps those non-traditional marriages where exclusivity is not a guiding expectation. It could be argued that as relationships shift from "casual dating" to "steadily dating" (Landis and Landis, 1953) and beyond, notions of exclusive property become more predominant. Such definitions appear to be prevalent in cohabiting relationships, for instance. For this paper, however, it seems more appropriate for the dating/courtship/mate selection stages of intimate relationships. Though the cultural definition of the appropriateness of such competition may vary depending on the stage of the dating relationship, it is generally considered legitimate to compete, as a rival, with another person of the same sex for the "hand" of a person desired by both. The person, or "object", of the competition is then in the position to make the "best possible deal." This, of course, is an example of sexual/emotional jealousy. However, it is congruent with other forms of jealousy as well. For instance, the legitimate competition could also be with the "threat" of going off to college, moving to take a job, peers and family, etc.

The "trespasser" conceptualization of the perceived threat, however, clearly seems the more appropriate approach to the study of marital jealousy. In this approach, jealousy is considered to be a reaction to the perceived threat of illegitimate loss of partner. With respect to sexual

jealousy, this property notion of marriage and the societal/normative recognition of such illegitimacy of trespassing has, in fact, traditionally been a part of our legal system, with adultery on the part of the "object" being a long established grounds for divorce and the "alienation of affection" on the part of the trespasser being grounds for civil suit by the "owner." In this case, then, the spouse is considered to be the property which one has obtained fairly through the competitive process of mate selection and any attempts to intrude on that "propertied relationship" are illegitimate and are of sufficient justification for the arousal of jealousy. Such jealousy arises in marriage, then, when one spouse feels threatened by the possible loss of the spouse. Again sexual jealousy is most obvious here, but other potential "trespassers" may be included also such as career, hobby, friends, or time spent out of the relationship.

For both the "rival" and the "trespasser" threats, from a structural exchange perspective, jealousy can be seen to arise in perceived competitive situations where such competition is viewed as restricting rewards and increasing costs in relationships and affecting one or both partners' comparison level alternatives. Though the dynamics of jealousy appear basically the same in the threatening encounters of "rivals" and "trespassers," the normative orientations, or Davis' "public", are differentiated considerably and not only function to determine whether or not competition is perceived by the marital partner but also largely determine whether such competition, if it is perceived, is defined as legitimate or illegitimate in nature. For marriage, the person already "possesses" the desired "property", i.e., the spouse, and feels threatened by the possible loss of the spouse and the resources he or she provides, with such a threat

being negative sanctioned. to varying degrees, in our society (indicated by such terms as "wife-stealer" or "husband-stealer" for sexual jealousy, being "married to one's job" or "football widow.")

Thus, marital jealousy may be viewed as the perceived threat of diminution or loss of the valued resources of the spouse. These valued resources may be both tangible and intangible in nature; including attention and affectionate interaction, sexual/emotional exclusivity, time spent in the relationship, the adequate performance of family roles, as well as more economic based resources such as money and standard of living. These resources may be more generally categorized as: (1) affectionate; (2) services; and (3) material. Relatedly, the threat of the trespasser may include the "object" spouses's potential or actual access to alternative resources from those that the "owner" spouse generally provides (thus, heightening "object's" comparison level alternatives), and as such, may present the threat of the diminution or loss of those traditionally-valued resources that "owner" spouse can provide to the other. Clanton and Smith (1977), for instance, argue that a particular experience of jealousy comes either from feeling excluded or from a fear of loss. This fits well into our guiding definition of jealousy; with feelings of exclusion relating to the threat of devaluation of one's own resources by the spouse, and fear of loss being congruent with the threat of diminution of loss of the valued resources of the spouse.

Marital jealousy, then, refers to the perceived threat by a marital partner of a "trespasser" potentially lessening access to the valued resources of the spouse and/or the perceived threat of the devaluation of one's own resources by the spouse; the nature of the perceived threat

being determined by normative and cognitive orientations of the marital partner. It should be noted that jealousy is defined as a perceptual phenomenon initially in that it is not important at the outset whether the threat is, in fact, real or not. The feeling of jealousy is governed by one's perception of a competitor or "trespasser." However, the experience of the perception itself results both from the normative orientations toward "spouse as property" and, thus, the normatively prescribed bases for jealousy, as well as the cognitive orientation of the person. The positive or negative sanctioning of the jealousy feeling by the "public", or one's reference group, however, also may largely determine whether or not the threat is considered real and a legitimate cause for worry and/or action. To the extent that the person appears to be "worried about nothing" or "overly possessive" from the perspective of friends, relatives, spouse, and others, the expression of jealousy is negatively sanctioned and, over time, the expression of feelings of jealousy to others, and the emotion itself, may become extinguished. On the other hand, however, the person's cognitive orientation toward the exchange relationship may generate feelings of jealousy even though such emotions are negatively sanctioned by others. Such emotions would probably then be either repressed, denied or reassessed. In such cases, the negatively sanctioned emotion of jealousy would not be expected to be directly manifested in behavioral, interactional or transactional aspect of the relationship. The actual existence of a threat, as acknowledged by the normative system, however, does become important in the behavioral, interactional or transactional dynamics of jealousy in the relationship.

Normative Factors In a Structural Exchange Theory of Jealousy

An examination of normative factors affecting marital exchange relationships regarding jealousy necessitates a discussion of the macro-social structural dynamics giving rise to jealousy in society generally and, more specifically, affecting spouses' orientations toward marriage and marital roles.

At the macro-level, Berscheid and Fel (1977) state that jealousy is universal in having been found to varying degrees in all cultures and it is inevitable that social mechanisms arise to to control it. Davis (1936) has viewed jealousy as a societal controlling mechanism itself and argues that the major positive function of jealousy is to preserve fundamental institutions of property: "The social function of jealousy against a trespasser is therefore the extirpation of any obstacle to the smooth running of the institutional machinery" (Davis, 1936:400-401). In Mead's (1977) discussion of cross-cultural variations on jealousy, she more specifically argues that one of the major structural or "social" causes of jealousy resides in the social stratification system. She states that any society which places groups of people at a disadvantage because of racial, religious or class distinctions will be "laying the groundwork for many jealous citizens." This argument could be extended to include groups of people at a disadvantage because of sex differences; i.e., women. Downing (1977) has also taken the position that jealousy will be exaggerated in any culture, such as ours, that worships monogamous marriage, a jealous monotheistic god and a monocentric, rational and repressed self. Such a culture encourages expectations of exclusiveness and, thus, plants the seeds of jealousy.

Regarding general marital orientations toward jealousy that are shaped

by the social system, Clanton and Smith (1977) have argued, for instance, that the current ambiguity about the emotion of jealousy in our society exists because of two major social movements: the women's movement and the so-called sexual revolution. These movements have served to redefine the nature of male-female relationships generally and with respect to expectations and obligations regarding sexuality. They have shifted our normative orientations toward marriage as a social institution, encouraging change in the predefined parameters of marital roles, in power/dependence relationships in marriages, and notions of exclusivity, sexual and otherwise, in marriage. As such, they have contributed to a redefining of the normative legitimacy of marital jealousy as a feeling-state and as a ongoing dynamic in marriage. Similarly, Ellis (1977) argues that the ongoing definition of normal and pathological jealousy in society is the "key" to understanding jealousy in our contemporary society. Thus, male/female differences in the experience and expressions of jealousy reflect male and female role expectations which are general and well-established, though undergoing considerable change, in our society.

Kemper's (1978) discussion of the roles of "status" and "power" for a social interactional theory of emotions provides a good point of departure for discussing in more detail the normative ingredients involved in considering marital exchange relationships regarding jealousy. "Status" is considered a structural component of the relationship, dictated by institutionalized marital role expectations and can be conceptualized as voluntary compliance, or "spontaneous consensus" (Brickman, 1974) based on legitimate authority, the extreme of which might be traditional patriarchal society. In contrast, "power" is an interactional variable, is attempted compliance

with met resistance, thus being involuntary, and requires power use generating conflict, negotiation, and/or "emergent consensus" (Brickman, 1974).

Structural exchange has similarly differentiated between structural and interactional aspects of marital exchange relationships. This has led to the distinction between symmetry/asymmetry in marital relationships, and equity/inequity in marital interaction. The institutionalized nature of expectations regarding marriage and marital roles is a structural characteristic traditionally dictating, at least in part, status-differentials and, thus relationship assymmetry which, in turn, give rise to resource and power differentials in the exchange relationship. Symmetry/Asymmetry is thus a structural characteristic of the relationship providing marital and family role differentiation and the differential distribution of resources in the relationship itself and influences whether marital partners actually engage in transactions which benefit one more than the other despite equal effort; thus, making equity/inequity a component of the exchange relationship itself.

The emergence of jealousy in marriage can be seen to occur from both structural and interactional factors. Structurally, the legitimation of jealousy has traditionally been inherent in culturally internalized expectations regarding the nature of marital relationships generally and the normatively perceived expectations of the husband and wife roles. Particularly in American society with its strong capitalistic orientation, the emphasis on private property and ownership has encompassed definitions toward marital relationships. One's spouse is viewed as one's property and any encroachment on that property by a "trespasser" is seen as a legitimate

basis for the development of jealousy. Only when the perceived threat is seen as irrational from the societal, or one's reference group, perspective is jealousy seen as being illegitimate. However, the asymmetry in this marriage-property relationship is quite clear. Traditionally, the wife has been societally viewed as the property of the husband to a much greater extent than the husband is viewed as the property of the wife (the taking of the husband's name at marriage, for example).

The traditional "double standard" both inside and outside of marriage is a good indicator of this asymmetry. Society provides more flexibility for the male sexually and otherwise for "trespassers" onto the relationship, whether the "trespasser" is another woman, a job or career, friends, hobbies, etc. The marital relationship has generally been considered only one of the domains in which the husband can legitimately operate. Sacrificing time and investment in a marriage for career purposes is generally accepted, if not expected. The husband can be "expected" to have some extramarital sexual involvement, though not generally positively sanctioned by society, but perhaps so by the husband's male friends. In contrast, the wife is allowed few "trespassers." Her primary orientation has been to the husband and family, with even extensive involvement with her kin, especially mothers and sisters, being often viewed by the husband as trespassing on the relationship. In this sense, from a cultural structural perspective, the husband has traditionally been given a greater "right" to be jealous. This might be partially illustrated by the greater prevalence of polygyny than polyandry both in our society, as alternative marital forms have emerged historically and cross-culturally, and the historically greater acceptance legally and otherwise of "male-adultery" than

"female-adultery." Availability of female prostitution provides another example. This, of course, relates to the culturally-defined asymmetrical nature of marital roles and the differential resource and authority distribution in favor of males.

Though practically all discussions of jealousy place its early development within sibling relationships, early discussions of jealousy in the social science literature generally referred to male jealousy of the female (e.g., Davis, 1936). As Bernard (1977) has observed, for instance, since sexual exclusivity of the husband was not a right traditionally given to women in marriage, there was thought to be no need for female jealousy to enforce it. However, more recent arguments (e.g., Veerhusen and Krain, 1980) have taken the position that the female is more jealous than the male because of gender-role insecurity. Though Verehusen and Krain found no support for this hypothesis, it should be noted that their research focused on jealousy in dating relationships rather than marriage. However, this explanation shifts the focus from the normative orientations regarding jealousy to the cognitive orientation, from a structural exchange perspective, and will be pursued in the next section.

From an exchange perspective, then, the male would perhaps be jealous because the wife has traditionally been explicitly defined as property, in accord with his status in marriage and, as such, she was assumed, and expected to be under the direct control of the husband. Any encroachment on that "property", whether highly valued property or not, is considered threatening and even rageful. Additionally, the wife is expected to voluntarily comply with that status-expectation. Perhaps this operates as a classic statement of the traditional double-standard, both sexually and

otherwise. Though the husband has more possible or real options (comparison level alternatives) than the wife, as a normative requirement, he protects his property. Traditionally, it would seem that the wife has had more of a "right" to be jealous, in the real sense that there are more threats to the loss of highly valued property. She has been more dependent than the husband, in having fewer viable alternatives and, thus, has had to more realistically fear the loss of those potential resources, tangible and intangible, of the husband. However, the socially prescribed status of the husband in marriage, and its resultant privileges, has left the wife powerless with respect to voluntary compliance by the husband and, thus, she has had to rely on other outlets for the expression of jealousy. As such, jealousy experiences of the wife can be seen to be manifested more in the interactional nature of the relationship, as she relies more on "personal" power rather than "structural" power dynamics, as the subsequent section will discuss. This provides a further example of the intricate linkage between normative and cognitive orientations of the individuals and the subsequent exchange relationship. At any rate it is necessary to examine closely those normative orientations toward jealousy which become internalized in marriage as they vary by culture, sex, social class, race, ethnicity, etc., as one attempts to systematically explore the dynamics of marital jealousy.

Cognitive Factors In Jealousy

The cognitive aspect of jealousy has been the most prevalent focus of research and theory about this phenomenon. As a personality variable, or emotion, jealousy has gotten considerable attention. However, most of the

literature has this cognitive dimension as its predominant, if not exclusive, concern. The "personality" variable most commonly related to jealousy has been low self-esteem. For instance, Lorenz (1977) specifies that the roots of jealousy are in self-doubt and low self-esteem. Similarly, Durbin (1977) has characterized jealousy as a reflex of insecurity and Walster and Walster (1977) see jealousy as related to one's definition of self-worth and self-esteem. Mead (1977) states that jealousy "...merely records the degree of the lover's insecurity." Other scholars (Viorst, 1977; Beecher and Beecher, 1971; White, 1981) have argued similarly. In empirical research, Bringle, et al., (1977) found jealousy to be correlated with low self-esteem, anxiety and dogmatism.

Berscheid and Fell (1977) conclude that the prime candidates for jealousy are those who are not only insecure in their relationship but who are also very dependent on their partners. However, as Viorst (1977) points out, low self-esteem and dependency are highly interrelated. It would be expected that individuals with low self-esteem would perceive their comparison level alternatives as low and would, then feel themselves more dependent on their spouse. Further, the nature of the power/dependence relationship in marriage, and the institutionalized definitions of the marital role structure, would tend to breed insecurity and low self-esteem in the more dependent partner, thus increasing the perceived value of the resources of the spouse more than what otherwise might be the case and heightening perceptions of threat to those resources. This emphasis on low self-esteem and dependency as precipitators of marital jealousy may be one reason why it has often been characterized as a "negative" emotion.

More in line with a structural exchange perspective, Whitehurst (1977) views jealousy as largely a function of social structure and gender-role socialization rather than seeing it largely as a function of feelings of personal inadequacy. Gender-role socialization, particularly the "division of labor" in traditional gender-roles, fosters dependency and a sense of personal inadequacy. Personal insecurities then result from social structural conditions. Especially the emphasis on ownership and private property generates norms for viewing spouse as property or possession and such norms may lead to feelings of insecurity since "...obviously, control of a person has to be more tenuous than control of other possessions" (Whitehurst, 1977:138). Similarly, Gilmarton (1977) argues that one's belief structure, or the internalized system of norms and ideas which create meaning for the individual, plays a large role in one's susceptibility to feelings of jealousy.

Applying structural exchange theory, the cognitive orientation of the individuals refers to the beliefs, values and general relationship orientation of the persons in the marriage and includes the above mentioned personality and attitudinal structure of the individuals. This cognitive orientation is determined by the general socialization experiences of the individual but, more particularly regarding marriage, is influenced by: (1) the normative orientations earlier discussed and internalized by the individuals; (2) internalized gender-role norms; and (3) the past bargaining or interpersonal exchange experiences of the individuals. Cognitive orientations differ from normative orientations in that the general "character" of the individuals, which this could be said to refer to, is determined not only by the general societal norms but, more par-

ticularly, by the prior social learning and value formation as influenced by significant others and the unique social experiences of the individual. Thus, though entire sectors of our society function within a similar generalized normative structure, the past unique socialization and interactional experiences produce differing personalities for each. Further, as has been previously delineated (Burns, 1973; McDonald, 1981), these cognitive orientations can be broadly classified as one of the following: (1) self orientation, or individualism; (2) joint self-other orientation, or cooperativeness; (3) negative-other orientation, or hostility; and, (4) positive-other orientation, or altruism. These operate as exchange rules (Meeker, 1971) which become reciprocated in the ongoing interactions in the relationship and generate the type of exchange relationship predominant in the marriage. The four types of exchange relationships, paralleling the reciprocated cognitive orientations are: (1) mutually exploitative; (2) mutually considerate; (3) mutually hostile; and, (4) mutually benevolent relationships, respectively.

The normative orientations affecting the general socialization environment regarding jealousy have been discussed. The individual's particular internalized socialization experiences regarding gender-role definitions are of major concern here, however. The internalized gender-role norms, which Scanzoni (1979) describes as a continuum from "traditional" to "modern," could be argued to play a major role in influencing the experience of jealousy and subsequent jealousy-related behaviors. The impact of internalized gender-role norms on jealousy situations would obviously have differing consequences for husbands and wives. However, these cognitive orientations would be expected to become reciprocated over

time in the relationship, through the interactional process of "generalized reciprocity" (McDonald, 1981). The more traditionally-oriented husbands are, the more they would tend to view the wife as exclusive property and potential trespassers would be viewed as more threatening. Also, they would tend to abide more by the traditional double-standard. Further, they would be more likely to view the wife's jealousy as "illegitimate" or inappropriate. The structural nature of the relationship would tend to be more asymmetrical in nature also. The wife would be expected to be more dependent on the husband due to institutionalized status/role differentiations and act accordingly. Similarly, the more traditional the wife, the more dependent she would actually be on him for resources and though the experienced threat of loss of those resources probably would be felt, given the "principle of least interest" (Waller and Hill, 1951) the more powerless she would be. Given the assumed reciprocated nature of such orientations, and the less communication evidenced in such traditional relationships (Komarousky, 1964), less negotiated behavior would be manifested as a result of jealousy on the part of the wife. Relationship inequity would tend to exist, then, though it is perhaps unlikely to be confronted due to the normatively asymmetrical role structure. The behavioral consequences would more often be expressed in denial, repression or anger rather than negotiation, as will be elaborated in the next section.

Conversely, the more modern the internalized gender-role norms the less threatened both would tend to be in the relationship. In these more companionate-based marriages, the definition of "trespasser" is narrowed considerably and definitions of "spouse as property" would be less for both. Feelings of jealousy are more likely to be openly expressed and nego-

tiated. Since resources would be more evenly distributed in such relationships and marital roles more evenly shared, providing a more symmetrical structure, marital norms regarding jealousy are likely to be more equitable and resulting from "emergent consensus" (Brickman, 1974). Additionally, since the relationship is more likely to be based on mutual commitment and trust, rather than power/dependence, jealousy is less likely to be experienced for both and less of a crucial factor in the relationship.

Given the assumed generalized reciprocity of these orientations, however, it still appears evident that in marriages, women tend to hold more modern gender-role norms than men (Scanzoni and Fox, 1980) thus, it could be posited that in such relationships, men would tend to be somewhat more jealous than women. However, consideration should also be given to the normatively sanctioned differentials which males and females internalize with respect to openly expressing emotions generally and jealousy emotions particularly, both positive and negative in nature. Current notions of greater female jealousy may be partially explained by the female's greater willingness to express her jealousy to her husband, whereas the "inexpressive" husband may have more difficulty admitting the threat, and thus may either sublimate or deny them.

As argued elsewhere (McDonald, 1981), individuals in symmetrical marriages would tend to develop a reciprocal "joint self-other" orientation, governed by norms of cooperativeness, and the resultant commitment and trust would serve to increase the number of individual pursuits and thus a lessened perception of potential "threats" to the relationship, i.e., the more available alternatives for each. Although greater available

alternatives for the spouse could be considered as potentially increasing perceived threats, and thus precipitating jealousy, it is the similar level of available alternatives for each that decreases jealousy and the more likely that jealousy, when it does arise, will emerge in marital interactions and be negotiated. In contrast, the greater the asymmetry and/or inequity in the relationship, the higher the experienced jealousy for each spouse, but the less it is negotiated in the relationship when experienced by either spouse; to the extent that it is manifested in interaction, it would tend to be more in the form of anger and ultimatums.

Similarly, the past bargaining or exchange experiences of the individuals, and thus their general exchange-orientations (Murstein, et al., 1977), will influence how experiences of jealousy will be dealt with in the relationship. Both general bargaining/exchange experiences and those directly related to jealousy need to be considered. The general bargaining/exchange "style" of the individual as well as prior bargaining experiences about jealousy become relevent. Past negative bargaining experiences which have been unpleasant, in the present or past relationships, and particularly regarding jealousy, may generate an avoidance approach rather than confrontation and/or negotiation. Previous experiences in which feelings of jealousy have proven to be unfounded or overdramatized, may make one more reluctant to experience, recognize or acknowledge the feeling in present interactions. Alternatively, the more legitimate, or real, past threats have been, the lower, perhaps, the jealousy "threshold" and the more prevalent the expression of jealousy feelings. At any rate, such prior experiences serve to affect the style of the interaction, as will be detailed in the section on the exchange dynamics of

jealousy.

Of course, internalized gender-role norms and past bargaining experiences are related, such that those couples with more modern gender-role norms might be expected to have had more experience and be more skilled at negotiating transactions regarding such issues. Further, the level of commitment and trust should allow for the expression of equity needs and negotiation for equity to take place within a more open and facilitative atmosphere. Such initial interactions would tend to be more cooperative, rather than competitive in nature and subsequent negotiated arrangement should be more palatable for both.

These cognitive orientations toward jealousy not only function to determine the degree to which jealousy will be felt by each of the marital partners and the form that its expression will take in the relationship. Additionally, they serve to indicate the differing "motivations" from which jealousy emerges. Mazur (1977) has characterized several types of jealousy which relate to the nature of the perceived threat by the individual. This typology fits nicely into the structural exchange model, particularly with respect to the relationship between the cognitive orientations of the couple and types of jealousy experienced. These include: (1) possessive-jealousy, which can be seen as the extreme orientation of spouse as property such that the spouse is seen only as an extension of self with little or no recognition of spouse's individual autonomy; (2) fear-jealousy, which involves the general overriding fear of being rejected and/or losing the other; (3) egotism-jealousy, which involves the attempt to deny spouse any freedom from institutionalized traditional role stereotypes and, in this sense, is closely related to possessive-jealousy; (4) exclusion-jealousy,

which involves the feeling of being left out of the enjoyable or important experiences of the spouse; and (5) competition-jealousy, which occurs as a result of jealousy of the achievements of the spouse and generates competition for equal recognition and success.

Possessive-jealousy and fear-jealousy are viewed by Mazur as the "classic" forms of jealousy and both can be seen to be related to traditional asymmetrical, propertied, power/dependence orientations toward marriage and the parallel gender-role definitions. In both cases, dependency on the relationship appears to predominate over commitment and trust in the relationship and these two types of jealousy could be argued to be on the decline as societal orientations toward marriage gradually shift toward a more symmetrical structure and equitable interaction. Similarly, egotism-jealousy is based on traditional gender-role stereotypes and the denial of gender-role, and related marital role, flexibility and would be expected to decline as relationships become more symmetrical and "emergent" with respect to role expectations in marriage. These three types of jealousy, as Mazur indicates, often are manifested in marital interaction by nonbargaining or non-negotiating strategies such as anger, resentment, ultimatums or other compensating and face-saving emotional expressions which mask feelings of insecurity, low self-esteem, and fear.

In contrast, exclusion-jealousy need not imply possessiveness or traditional role stereotypes, is accompanied by feelings of neglect or disappointment, and is more often confronted in interaction and negotiated from a position of commitment and trust, rather than dependence and with the "threat" being more amorphous. Exclusion-jealousy, then, is perhaps more often experienced and negotiated in modern, symmetrical marriages and may

be the emerging typical jealousy experienced in "mutually considerate" relationships based on "joint self-other" cognitive orientations as couples attempt to development and maintain a balance between their individual and interpersonal needs, goals and interests. Finally, competition-jealousy may be the second major type of jealousy emerging in modern, equalitarian marriages as spouses attempt to ensure the symmetrical and equitable nature of their relationship through a concern for maintaining an equitable balance of resources in the relationship. Competition-jealousy also can be seen to have its roots in insecurity or low-self esteem and the resultant fear of future relationship imbalance. Such jealousy may occur in relationships in which insecurity sabotages the building of high levels of reciprocal trust and commitment. However, competition-jealousy appears also to be highly negotiable through the explication of the valued resources of the spouse and the maintenance of family role-sharing and sufficient flexibility of role expectations in order to maintain the equitable balance of resources in the marriage.

Lastly, it should be commented that differing types of jealousy evoke differing forms of emotions. For instance, Mazur (1977) characterizes possessive-jealousy as evoking a rageful reaction while exclusion-jealousy is the most painful and, perhaps, the most depressing type of reaction. For the purpose at hand, the emotional form which the experience of jealousy takes becomes relevant through the manner by which jealous behavioral reactions get translated into types of interpersonal interaction and, thus, shape the nature of the exchange relationship regarding the jealousy situation.

Commitment, Trust and the "Jealousy" Exchange Relationship

The major strength of a structural exchange theory of marital interaction over more traditional social exchange formulations is recognition of the unique characteristics of the marital relationship, as has been previously discussed. These include the normative orientations toward marriage and the institutionalized status and role expectations in marriage. These normative orientations and the more particular cognitive orientations of the partners include an "ideal-type" expectation of the relationship being primarily based on a mutual love relationship with the reciprocated cognitive orientations being "positive-other" in nature and the exchange relationship being the "mutually benevolent" type. Additionally, a strong temporal element is included with marriage being defined as "life-long" at best and "long-term" at the least. However, traditionally these ideal-type expectations have also dictated differential status/role expectations resulting in most relationships being assymmetrical and imbalanced and resulting in the nature of the exchange relationship being largely governed by power/dependence dynamics. However, as contemporary marriages are shifting away from "wife as property" to "wife as junior partner" and the increasing visibility of "wife as equal partner" relationships (Scanzoni, 1972), it has been argued that the power/dependence norms of marriage are being gradually replaced by voluntary commitment and trust as major factors operating to maintain stable relationship (McDonald, 1981). Of course, commitment and trust have always been ingredients in marriage, but whereas they had previously been part of the institutionalized normative system, they are increasingly emerging out of interactional dynamics within the marital relationship. For instance,

it appears that individuals are less committed to the institution of marriage per se than in the past, but rather more concerned for the level of dyadic commitment in the relationship. Similarly, institutionalized, or prescribed, trust in marriage is being replaced by interpersonal trust. The development of interpersonal trust and commitment in marriage, then, is initially influenced by reciprocated cognitive orientations of the partners that emerge and are maintained or changed in a dynamic fashion within the marital exchange relationship.

This structural exchange perspective on dependence, trust and commitment in marriage as a result of social change is necessary for the examination of the role of jealousy in marriage. Social trust and dyadic commitment in marriage function in a direct relationship to spouses' comparison level alternatives. In this regard, commitment is a personal construct, whereas trust is a perceptual construct. Dyadic commitment refers to one's own orientation to the relationship, thus being affected by, and affecting, one's own comparison level alternatives, whereas trust is one's perception of the spouse's commitment to the relationship, or selected aspects of it. It is related, then, to one's perception or estimation of the comparison level alternatives of the spouse. However, both constructs can also be seen as interactional and complementary in that both increasingly tend to emerge and be maintained or modified, based on the interpersonal dynamics of the relationship itself. One's degree of trust in his/her spouse is a direct function of the judgement of the spouse's degree of commitment to the relationship. This reciprocal nature of the concept is an outcome of the previously discussed notion of "generalized reciprocity" in marriage. The higher levels of dyadic commitment lower

one's comparison level alternatives thus minimizing the exploration of possible alternatives to the relationship. Similarly, a high level of trust lowers one's estimation of comparison level alternatives of spouse and minimizing the uncertainty of the spouse pursuing alternatives to the relationship. As levels of commitment and trust are lowered, the nature of the marital exchange relationship is changed in that a lack of commitment and/or trust dictates a more direct quid pro quo, or self-oriented, exchange relationship. High levels of each, on the other hand, contribute to more indirect, or joint-self other oriented, exchange dynamics, making "individual profit-maximization" progressively irrelevant," and the exchange relationship governed more by cooperativeness.

At the outset, a spouse's perception of real or potential competition, a "threat," heightens or makes unstable that individual's estimation of the comparison level alternatives of the spouse. This leads to a decrease in the level of trust for the "object" spouse. If the level of dyadic commitment is high, the lower trust should be experienced as inequity in the relationship and restoration of equity would probably be sought through confrontation and/or negotiation. Equity theory has argued that when inequity is felt, the predominant emotions experienced are either anger or guilt; anger if the felt inequity is to the individual's deprivation and guilt if the inequity to the advantage of the individual. It might be the case then that the initial direct expression of jealousy in the marriage relationship would be anger, with one major strategy of attempting to restore trust, and thus equity, being to elicit guilt in the partner in order to get reassurance that the perceived threat is, in fact, not a threat, or no longer a threat, at all. In that sense, then, the attempt to

restore equity is the soliciting of reassurance that the individual's perception of the level of spouse's commitment is stable and accurate. If such reassurance is not forthcoming and confrontation and/or negotiation are not successful in restoring perceived equity the jealous spouse would tend, then, to reduce his or her level of commitment to the spouse. Equity perceptions would thus be restored through the relative lessening of commitment and, thus, a realignment of commitment to and trust of spouse in order to restore symmetry and to generate similar comparison level alternatives. Negotiation and bargaining would be likely to emerge in this event in restoring equity and as commitment and trust are lessened, the exchange relationship shifts from that of indirect, cooperative exchange to more explicit concern for equity and general relationship symmetry in terms of short-term outcomes. In other words, trust, as perceived commitment of spouse, leads to the avoidance of uncertainty in the relationship. The perception of a "threat" by the jealous partner leads to increased uncertainty and implies a real or potential lessened commitment on the part of the spouse. Jealous behavior, then, is an attempt to restore spouse's commitment by increasing certainty, through reassurance, ultimatums, negotiation, etc., and removing available alternatives. The continued existence of this uncertainty influences the individual to be more calculating and to seek short-term, profit-maximizing outcomes to restore equity.

Of course, dyadic commitment and dependence are not mutually exclusive concepts and the preceding discussion focusing on voluntary commitment, rather than involuntary dependence, recognizes a commitment-dependence continuum. The shift from traditional, asymmetrical to modern, symmetrical

marriage, thus, assumes movement on that continuum toward greater commitment and less dependency. In contrast to the perception of equitable available alternatives in commitment-oriented relationships, dependence exists when one spouse perceives the other spouse as having greater available alternatives than self and, as earlier observed, dependence, then, implies power on the part of the spouse with greater available alternatives, usually the husband. In such power/dependence relationships, the more powerful spouse may use the power position to minimize jealousy-related interactions in the relationship, perhaps, forcing the more dependent partner to repress or deny jealousy feelings and/or avoid jealousy interactions. However, in most relationships governed by power/dependence, with the male being the more powerful one, his power is more structural in nature as a result of the normatively-sanctioned asymmetry in the relationship. However, this does not mean that the wife has no access to power usage. In fact, Cook and Emerson (1978) demonstrate that power use varies inversely with commitment in relationships, such that power use by both partners would be more prevalent in power/dependence relationships. However, whereas the male has more direct, structural power resources, females are generally constrained to using more indirect and personal forms of power such as persuasion and manipulation and the power resources are more limited to socio-emotional or "service-related" factors such as expressions of love, sexual interest and general affection toward spouse or the performance of household tasks.

In this regard, White (1980) has investigated sexual jealousy inducement in relationshps. Jealousy inducement is engaged in by the more dependent partner in attempting to gain power and control in the relationship by

suggesting to the more powerful partner that one has more available alternatives than he/she perhaps actually has. Using the "principle of least interest" in an exchange/power context, White suggests that "...a person relatively more involved in a romantic relationship (more dependent) may be able to gain greater outcomes (or control) by leading his or her partner to believe that an attractive alternative relationship is available. To reduce the threat to self or relationship, the threatened partner would have to act to increase the level of outcomes of the threatening partner." (White, 1980:222). This attempt to increase outcomes could be translated into attempts to make the relationship more balanced and thus to decrease power/dependence and to increase the commitment of partner. White found that females who reported greater involvement in this relationship were more likely than others to report jealousy inducement and females were more likely to report inducement in general than males. Further, females were more likely to report inducing jealousy in order to gain increasing rewards. The most popular method of inducing jealousy was to discuss or exaggerate current attractions to others. Congruent with the perspective of this paper, White concludes that jealousy inducement functions as an exercise of power consistent with both sex roles and the position of relative dependence. Further: "The suggestion that inducing jealousy can be viewed as a power tactic opens up the possibility that ordinary jealousy is related to the way in which power is shared by the couple" (White, 1980:226). This research provides preliminary support for major tenets of a structural exchange approach to jealousy. It should be noted, however, that White's research was concerned with romantically involved partners and not marital partners per se. Thus, these findings should be viewed

cautiously with respect to marital interaction, though the basic premise of the research appears applicable.

A Typology of Exchange in Jealousy-Situations

The manner in which feelings of jealousy are handled in the marital relationship has been alluded to often in this paper. However, this section attempts to more systematically explicate a typology of exchange interactions involving jealousy and the conditions under which such exchanges are likely to occur. Other writers (Buunk, 1982; Constantine, 1977) have also presented similar discussions, but without the theoretical underpinnings of the present model. This typology of jealousy-related exchanges includes the following categories: (1) Avoidance; (2) Verbal force; (3) Physical force; (4) Confrontation; (5) Negotiation.

Avoidance is actually a non-interaction category. However, it must be recognized. In this case, the jealous spouse's reaction is to avoid interaction related to feelings of jealousy. Avoidance is more likely to occur in power/dependency relationships by the more dependent partner, usually the female. The dependent spouse is more likely to avoid discussions of the feelings of jealousy for a variety of reasons. First, the normative orientation dictating relationship asymmetry and, perhaps, acceptance of a double-standard for the husband-wife relationship, sexually and otherwise, might contribute to the lack of recognition of inequity. Second, the dependence and self-esteem factors may make confrontation or negotiation regarding the jealousy a threat in and of itself, perhaps making "real" the perceived "threat," or available alternative, and possibly "driving away" the spouse. Third, the jealous spouse's limited

available alternatives may make the individual desirous of maintaining the relationship at any cost. The dependent jealous spouse may then try to deny, repress or conceal the feelings of jealousy. However, even though interaction regarding the jealousy may be avoided, it may have behavioral or interactional impacts, such as the previously discussed jealousy inducement or the withholding of affectionate, sexual or service-related resources, or attempts to subtly instill guilt in the spouse.

Verbal force is used to describe jealousy-related interaction which is not negotiation- or bargaining-oriented. This would include verbal explosions which involve expressions of anger, rage or resentment. These also would be most prevalent in power/dependence-oriented relationships and could come from either spouse. The more powerful spouse, usually the husband, might lay out the rules regarding exclusivity that he expects the wife to follow. However, this would tend to be related to his status, or structural power, position. The wife, on the other hand, might attempt to exert her personal power in expressing her dissatisfaction and, perhaps, disguising fear as anger. The basic characteristic of verbal force as a category is that it is noncontingent-oriented interaction; in other words, it is not an attempt to negotiate a realignment in the relationship with respect to the jealousy situation, but rather is exclusively an expression of anger and hostility. Again, the major intended outcome would be to alleviate the threat through the invoking of fear or guilt. Although this type of jealousy expression might occur in commitment-oriented relationships also, in those relationships it would likely be a precurser to negotiation.

Physical force is the extreme expression of jealousy, most often sexual jealousy, and the type we often see depicted in the media. It is the utilization of violence against the "object" spouse, the "trespasser," or both, in order to end the jealousy-related behavior. As an extension of verbal force, it is almost exclusively unique to power/dependence relationships and could be considered an irrational rage reaction. It is predominantly a male reaction for two reasons. First, the husband in asymmetrical marriage usually has the more "spouse-as-property" orientation. Secondly, aside from the use of weapons, the male is more accustomed to and more capable of using force and inflicting physical damage to the spouse. To the extent that the wife attempts to utilize physical force, it tends to be more tokenistic, than physically harmful. In general, it is probably the least utilized manner of addressing the jealousy situation and is, perhaps, the "path of last resort."

Confrontation is the most direct exchange regarding the jealousy and the most obvious attempt at usage of marital power in resolving the jealousy situation. As such, confrontation often involves the issue of ultimatums to the spouse and probably calls into question the basic structural and interactional foundations that have maintained the relationship. The direct ultimatums call for the termination of whatever dynamics motivated the feeling of jealousy, or alternatively an ultimate restructuring or dissolving the relationship to counter the continuing jealousy-invoking situation. Such ultimatums are generally couched in the terms of "If you do x, then I'm going to y." This is a type of negotiation, but very direct, individually-oriented and primitive in attempts to gain non-voluntary compliance, and such ultimatums may be real or may be a "bluffing"

strategy. Confrontation may be most prevalent in asymmetrical power/dependence relationships in initially dealing with the feeling of jealousy. Husband expressions of this type of exchange are probably based more on his status/structural power, whereas for the wife, it is probably a usage of her personal power or what might be termed her "structural power" within the relationship such as the threatened removal from the husband of shared resources such as children, joint property, etc. Confrontation as an exchange strategy in commitment-oriented relationships probably occur after open negotiation has failed and the exchange-nature of the relationship has shifted from being cooperative-to competitive-oriented and the seeking of equity at all costs.

Negotiation is the final and most open and honest type of jealousy expression. Negotiation involves the expression of one's true feelings with respect to the jealousy situation and discussions which are based on assumptions of commitment and trust in the relationship. Thus, the restoration of feelings of equity are generally sought through indirect bargaining, or negotiation, with an attempt to maintain "maximum joint-profit" in the relationship. These negotiation strategies are more prevalent in commitment-oriented relationships and maybe occur more often, but be less dramatic in nature, since they may emerge in ongoing dialogue between the spouses. In many cases, such dialogue may be considered "preventive" in that potential jealousy-situations may be discussed, and strategies for handling them negotiated before actual feelings of jealousy surface. In addition, high levels of commitment and trust, if maintained, narrow considerably the range of potential threats to the relationship.

It is important to recognize, however, that such jealousy situations,

and their cognitive, behavioral and interactional manifestations, are dynamic in nature. As such, more than one of the interactional categories may come into play in any jealousy experience. Further, jealousy, by definition, involves a perceived "threat" of some sort and elicits competitive feelings by "owner" of "threat" and is, at the least, a momentary reassessment by the jealous person of both spouses' comparison level alternatives. Thus, feelings of inequity are ultimately involved and the reevaluation of one's commitment to spouse and degree of trust of spouse takes place.

SUMMARY

The general argument presented here is that the normative definitions of marriage and marital roles regarding the nature of symmetry/asymmetry and, particularly, regarding the parameters and legitimacy of jealousy, and the reciprocated cognitive orientations of the spouses related to gender-role socialization and past bargaining experiences, dictate, in large part, how spouses deal with and resolve or cope with jealousy when it arises as a major factor in the marital exchange relationship. A structural exchange perspective takes these differing dimensions into account and, thus, is one major avenue by which to more fully understand marital jealousy. Only further empirical research will testify to the viability of this model.

REFERENCES

Beecher, M., and W. Beecher

1971 The Mark of Cain: An Anatomy of Jealousy. New York: Harper and Row.

Bernard, J.

1977 "Jealousy and marriage." Pp. 141-150 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Berscheid, E., and J. Fei

1977 "Romantic love and sexual jealousy." Pp. 101-109 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Brickman, P.

1974 Social Conflict. Lexington, Massachusetts: Heath Publishing Company.

Bringle, R., S. Roach, C. Andler, and S. Evenbeck

1977 "Correlates of jealousy." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Burns, T.

1973 "A structural theory of social exchange" Acta Sociologica 16 (3):188-208.

Buunk, B.

1982 "Strategies of jealousy: Styles of coping with extramarital involvement of the spouse." Family Relations 31 (January):13-18.

Clanton, G., and L. Smith

1977 Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Constantine, L.

1977 "Jealousy: Techniques for intervention." Pp. 190-198 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Cook, K., and R. Emerson

1978 "Power, equity and commitment in exchange networks." American Sociological Review 43 (October):721-739.

Darwin, C.

1888 Descent of Man. Vol. 2. London.

Davis, K.

1936 "Jealousy and sexual property." Social Forces 14 (March):395-405.

Downing, C.

1977 "Jealousy: A depth-psychological perspective." Pp. 72-79 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Durbin, K.

1977 "On sexual jealousy." Pp. 36-45 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Ellis, A.

1977 "Rational and irrational jealousy." Pp. 170-179 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Foster, G.

1972 "The anatomy of envy: A study in symbolic behavior." Current Anthropology 13 (April):165-186.

Gilmartin, B.

1977 "Jealousy among the swingers." Pp. 152-158 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Jaremko, M., and R. Lindsey

1979 "Stress coping abilities of individuals high and low in jealousy." Psychological Reports 44 (April):547-553.

Kemper, T.

1978 A Social Interactional Theory of Emotions. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Komarovsky, M.

1964 Blue-Collar Marriage. New York: Random House.

Landis, T., and M. Landis

1953 Building a Successful Marriage. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Lobsenz, N.

1977 "Taming the green-eyed monster." Pp. 26-34 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Mazur, R.

1977 "Beyond jealousy and possessiveness." Pp. 181-187 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

McDonald, G.

1981 "Structural exchange and marital interaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family 43 (November):825-839.

McDonald, G., and M. Osmond

1980 "Jealousy and trust: Unexplored dimensions of social exchange dynamics." Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations Pre-Conference Workshop on Theory Construction and Research Methodology, Portland, Oregon, 1980.

Mead, M.

1977 "Jealousy: Primitive and civilized." Pp. 115-126 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Meeker, B.

1971 "Decisions and exchange." American Sociological Review 32 (June):485-495.

Murstein, B., M. Cerreto, and M. MacDonald

1977 "A theory and investigation of the effect of exchange-orientation on marriage and friendship." Journal of Marriage and the Family 39 (August):543-548.

Scanzoni, J.

1972 Sexual Bargaining: Power Politics in the American Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

1979 "Social processes and power in families." Pp. 295-316 in W. Burr, R. Hill, F. Nye, and I. Reiss (eds.), Contemporary Theories about the Family: Research-Based Theories (Vol. 1). New York: The Free Press.

Scanzoni, J., and G. Fox

1980 "Sex roles, family and society: The seventies and beyond." Journal of Marriage and the Family 42 (November):743-756.

Schachter, S.

1964 "The interaction of cognitive and physiological determinants of emotional state." P. 49-80 in L. Berkowitiz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 1. New York: Academic Press.

Schoeck, H.

1969 Envy: A Theory of Social Behaviour. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Shettel-Neuber, J., T. Bryson, and L. Young

1978 "Physical attractiveness of the 'other person' and jealousy." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 4 (October):612-615.

Sullivan, H.

1953 The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton.

Veerhusen, D., and M. Krain

1980 "The green eyed monster: Jealousy in dating relationships." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, April.

Viorst, J.

1977 "Confessions of a jealous wife." Pp. 17-25 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Waller, W., and R. Hill

1951 The Family. New York: The Dryden Press.

Walster, E., and G. Walster

1977 "The social psychology of jealousy." Pp. 91-99 in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Westermarck, E.

1922 The History of Human Marriage. Fifth Edition. New York: Macmillan.

White, G.

1980 "Inducing jealousy: A power perspective." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 6 (June):222-227.

1981 "Jealousy and partner's perceived motives for attraction to a rival." Social Psychology Quarterly 44 (March):24-30.

Whitehurst, R.

1977 "Jealousy and American values." Pp. 136-139 in in G. Clanton and L. Smith (eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.